

Application No.:	09/675,406
Amendment Dated:	August 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of:	October 23, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-20 and 22-25 are pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-20 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316 to De Boor et al. (“De Boor”), Nokia 6160 Owner’s Manual (“Nokia”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20010041590 to Silberfenig et al. (“Silberfenig”).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 17 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the step of “receiving a dial signal in response to a user selecting a call initiation button of a selectable interface of the computing device to initiate a phone call, said computing device integrating phone functions within said computing device’s hardware, said computing device suspending non-phone functions in response to said user selecting said call initiation button.” Similarly, claim 10 has been amended to recite that “the selectable interface includes a call initiation button that, when activated, initiates a phone call to a last called phone number if digits were not received from the selectable interface just before the call initiation button is activated in response to an action by a user, and the call initiation button, when activated, initiates a phone call to a phone number corresponding to digits received from the selectable interface when the digits are received just before the call initiation button is activated in response to the action by the user, said computing device suspending non-phone functions in response to said user selecting said call initiation button.” Claim 17 has been amended to recite the step of “receiving a dial signal in response to a selection, by a user, of a call initiation button on the selectable interface to initiate a phone call, said computing device suspending non-phone functions in response to said user selecting said call initiation button.”

Application No.:	09/675,406
Amendment Dated:	August 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of:	October 23, 2006

As mentioned in the background, integrating mobile phone functions within a PDA has many advantages. Palm sized portability is combined with the higher resolution displays and robust operating system functions of a PDA to ensure more convenient functionality for the consumer. Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of combining phone functionality into a PDA form factor. Part of the problem of integrating phone and PDA functionality is the potential for PDA functions to interfere with phone functions. Therefore, the present invention proposes that the computer device suspend any non-phone functions in response to a user selecting the call initiation button.

The Examiner's base reference, De Boor, is directed to a man-machine interface assembled from a mark-up language. Particularly, De Boor is directed to integrating world wide web (HTML mark-up language) with telephony functions in a computing device. The telephony functions are assumed to exist already in the computing device so that world web capability can be appended to the telephony function. Therefore, De Boor does not disclose or teach that the computer device suspend any non-phone functions in response to a user selecting the call initiation button.

The shortcomings of De Boor are not overcome by Nokia or Silberfenig nor are Nokia or Silberfenig cited for such teachings. Nokia is directed to a manual for a mobile phone without personal digital assistant functions. Silberfenig is directed to a combination cellular phone and email device. Silberfenig does not teach or suggest a personal digital assistant such as a computing device directed to information management. Therefore, neither Nokia nor Silberfenig teach or suggest that the computer device suspend any non-phone functions in response to a user selecting the call initiation button.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Hawkins, Nokia and Silberfenig does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 17 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-16, 18-20 and 22-25, by their dependency on claims 1, 10 and 17 respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 09/675,406
Amendment Dated: August 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: October 23, 2006

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the Amendment after Final and reconsider all presently outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: October 23, 2006

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860